

INTEGRITY



: the twelfth issue :
SEPTEMBER, 1947 ✓ Vol. 1., No. 12

SUBJECT: SECURITY AND GOD'S PROVIDENCE

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	- - - - -	1
AND ALL THESE THINGS WILL BE ADDED		
By EDWARD WILLOCK	- - - - -	4
A JOB'S A JOB (a story)		
By NEIL MACCARTHY	- - - - -	9
THE ANATOMY OF DESPAIR		
By BRUCE VAWTER, C.M.	- - - - -	16
BUILDERS IN VAIN		
By CATHERINE CHRISTOPHER	- - - - -	20
APOSTATES' HARVEST		
By C. M. LARKINS	- - - - -	26
THE FRYING PAN AND THE FIRE		
By WILLIAM DAVEY, T.O.P.	- - - - -	30
BOOK REVIEWS	- - - - -	48

INTEGRITY is published by lay Catholics and
dedicated to the task of discovering the new
synthesis of RELIGION and LIFE for our times.

Vol. I, No. 12

September 1947

Published Monthly by Integrity Publishing Co., 1556 York Avenue New York
28 N. Y., Pl 9-8313. Edited by Edward Willock and Carol Jackson. En-
tered as Second Class Matter October 14, 1946 at the Post Office at
New York, N. Y. Under the Act of March 3, 1897. All single
copies 25 cents each; yearly subscriptions domestic \$3.00,
Canadian \$3.50, Foreign \$4.00.

EDITORIAL



OR THE pulse of an age, study its use of words. Only an age which loves money would coin phrases like "there's no *percentage* in it," and "you look like a million dollars."

And only an age which has ceased in practice to respect God's Providence would develop institutions called The *Guarantee Trust Company*, The *Providential Loan*, and The *Securities Exchange*. All these words, which today suggest the realm of finance to us, really per-

tain to the forgotten doctrine of God's Providence. It might be useful to review that doctrine.

Providence is God in respect of His ordering of all things. Nothing happens in the universe unless God wills it or allows it. God even moves our free wills (without, mysteriously, interfering with their freedom). It is not correct to say only of a happy event that "it is providential." Everything is providential. God is never foiled. God is never frustrated. All things work together, ultimately, for God's glory. How this works out in the whole is mysterious, but we can see some of the workings, especially when good comes out of evil.

Security is a word which we have come to consider as meaning "safe," or "certain." It originally meant, and it literally means, "without care." How obviously that change is the result of our growing materialism! To be without care is to have confidence in God, to have the virtue of hope, and in this sense the most secure person is a St. Francis of Assisi, or a contemplative nun, a person with no material possessions whatever, and with a correspondingly deep trust in God.

But we have turned away from God and sought our security in material things. We thought that if we only had a house, money in the bank, stocks, insurance, then we would be safe, without care. But the more we hope in these things, the further we are from being without care. If you want to find a man who is really solicitous for tomorrow, go see the multimillionaire. Care decreases as you go down the scale of wealth, until you find the poor, as poor, relatively unconcerned. But for the really carefree you must seek those who have made themselves poor for the love of God. Most people have observed this is so, but being orientated to materialism they can't help hoping that if they increase their \$100,000 in the bank to \$200,000 in the bank, they will sleep easier at night. The more we try to solve the problem of insecurity on the materialistic level, the more obviously it shows itself to be primarily a spiritual problem. Just as security is a way of expressing the virtue of hope (a man is without care because he trusts

in God), so insecurity, by contrast, is a sort of way of expressing despair, which is manifested through anxiety. That is why one of our articles on security in this issue is fittingly called **THE ANATOMY OF DESPAIR**. We have never had such insecurity. We have never had such despair. We think that if we have social security and tenure and all those other things that we will be happy, but it is really the other way around. It is because we are unhappy and despairing that we seek so desperately for those things, and the fact that we are not satisfied with a few of them, but want more and more, is evidence that we are looking for something in a place where it is not to be found.

Virtue is the key to our role in God's Providence. All things conspire to God's glory, but not all things conspire to our salvation or to harmony in the temporal order. Here things work out happily only in proportion as we obey God's commandments, because His laws reflect, in the moral order, the potential harmony of secondary causes. This whole doctrine of God's Providence is contained in the sixth chapter of Matthew, reprinted on the back cover of this issue. Our duty is plainly stated: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His Justice," and our reward promised, that "all these things will be added unto you." It is because Providence operates that way. Hardly anyone believes this any more. Those who practise virtue often do so with a martyred air, as though it were against their own best interests, while most of us just flatly don't believe that all these things will be added (that is, we despair) and run our lives according to the law of expediency, which says "make sure you get yours, and then practise what virtue you can squeeze in." We think it is very important to point out that God's law really does operate, even today when it would seem as though all the cards are stacked against the practising Christian, so we have included testimony on the subject in **AND ALL THESE THINGS WILL BE ADDED**. But we must also avoid thinking that obedience to the divine law will be rewarded in worldly success. Everything will come out all right in the end, but the end is the Beatific Vision, not the presidency of General Motors. Nevertheless, for what God wants us to do here he will provide the means, and it is the rare person who is tested unto folly, as was Job. We can often see the uses of unemployment, as did the man in the story in this issue (**A JOB'S A JOB**). When the generality of men practise virtue, things in general work out well. But even if the generality of men practise vice, it still is true that "to them that love God all things work together unto good," as St. Paul has assured us.

If men won't do things God's way, they run into trouble, and then they try to invent ways of staving off disaster. Our economic history

for several hundred years past can best be understood as the efforts of men to build defenses against the consequences of society's sins. Capitalism sought refuge in large fortunes and insurance. Socialism is the development, or if you like, the decadence of capitalism. It is solicitous of every detail of a man's life in the name of security. If life under capitalism was unlovely, life under socialism is dreary beyond measure. We have two articles this month protesting the inhumanity of such an existence. One (BUILDERS IN VAIN) is about life in a government housing project; the other (APOSTATES' HARVEST) comes from England where the mechanization of life is all but complete.

We have also included a remarkably clear exposition of the essential errors of both capitalism and socialism (THE FRYING PAN AND THE FIRE). The author sees what is frequently missed, that the planned state which is almost upon us just couldn't have evolved if men had given God His due. When we deny God's Providence, we start ordering things ourselves, as though we were God. The state which sets out to be wholly Providential must necessarily also be Omnipotent.

THE EDITORS



CO-CREATORS

Men of vision search and grope,
To find a name for a washing soap,
While God takes care of little things,
Like turning Winters into Springs.

AND ALL THESE THINGS WILL BE ADDED

To the modern mind no state is quite so terrifying in its aspect as that of being utterly dependent upon God. This state is looked upon as synonymous with hopelessness, destitution, and despair. The cheeks of parents blanch at the thought that such a fate may await their children. Worried business men spend sleepless nights counting on their fingers, or re-examining their inventories, assets, debits, and liabilities, in terror that the near future may find them utterly dependent. It is this fear that sets neighbor against neighbor, each one fearing that the other may carry the contagious germ of insecurity. This fear is the root of many people's worldly ambitions. They are not as much greedy as they are afraid. When the vision of wealth and power grows dim, the fear of dependence comes in to take over. Security, the end of the modern man's labors, is the rosy heaven set up by contrast with the dark hell of being dependent upon God.

Those who claim a special familiarity with God, are often no more remarkable for their trust in His Beneficence than those who deny Him. The timidity of the elect, with all their petty fears and need for reassurance, does not make election appear to be a particularly attractive state. The pagan is confirmed in his non-belief. If the heirs to Heaven distrust their Father, who can trust Him?

This morbid fear of dependence upon God, so current among the moderns, is bulwarked by two theological misconceptions:

1) That God's Mercy is only operative in the breach, when things go wrong.

2) That God is *our* Helper, an omnipotent accessory to *our* plans. Informal research into popular opinion among nominal Christians would lead a pagan to conclude that God is a supplementary agent to a first-aid kit and a bank account. After penicillin has failed, all you can do *then* is pray; if you have overdrawn on your account, then you had better start making a novena. Thus a weird phantasm of the Deity takes shape in the modern mind: an administering angel, who, like the shyster lawyer, is always found at the scene of an accident; a beam-ing philanthropist who comes to the door with groceries when the cupboard is bare; a Santa Claus who frequents sick rooms ready to bestow new livers for old for a prescribed portion of fervent prayer. Along the road of life, the Deity is looked upon with the same mis-

givings as the glass-paneled box hanging on the side of buses: "In case of emergency, break glass, and pull down hook!" One anxiously hopes that the glass need never be broken! While this distorted idea of God's Mercy exists, it is small wonder that dependence upon Him will be feared. Instead of the father of the household, God is looked upon as the family doctor or dentist, someone whom you would prefer not to call upon . . . if possible.

The second calumny against God which distorts our concepts of His Mercy is the belief cherished by secularized Christians that God is *their* Helper. According to this theory (it is more a dream than a rational theory), God made the world quite a while ago, then He left it up to us to do with it what we will, at the same time promising us that if we find the going tough, He will send us what we need in the way of goods or expert advice. This places all the *initiative* on us. We decide what we want to do, then we beckon blasphemously to God and say, "Here, dear God, give me a lift." This accounts for the too frequent sight of Christians engaged in shady businesses involving exploitation of the poor, or appeals to concupiscence, going to church for a little Divine help.

This accounts for an otherwise inexplicable practice that went on during the war: both German and American Christians praying to God for victory, as though the motives and end of the war had no interest for God at all!

Regardless of what men may think, God's Mercy is not only operative in the time of emergency, but all the time. God not only restores health, He sustains health. He holds the whole universe in being, bringing it to fruition in an orderly sequence of events. Nothing exists apart from God, not even an atheist, or the idea of atheism. To be *real* means to be sustained by God. All things begin with Him, continue in Him, and end in Him. The men afloat upon a raft in an endless sea, as they cried out to God for help, were not wailing down the passages of a strange and unknown world. Before they started to pray, God was with them. He held up the waters upon which their raft was held. It was He Who rolled the sun through the sky, and laid over them the blanket of the night. It was He Who aroused in them the hope that He would answer if they cried out across the desolation. As He led them to their rescuers He merely continued the Mercy He had begun when He gave them life.

Regardless of what men think, it is we who are God's helpers. All initiative lies with Him. He has a plan which he reveals to us through His Church, through His teachers, and through the grace with which He moves us and the opportunities He presents to us. This plan excludes *nothing*. All creatures less than man cooperate with God's plan of necessity. They have no choice in the matter. In man,

God respects the free will which He placed there, and so we are free to cooperate or not. We are free to obey His laws or not. We are free to share His Love or not.

To deny the omnipresence of God, His everywhere-ness, is to deny reality. A man may stand before a whirling propeller, and say it is not there, but it is there none the less, as he would readily observe were he to extend his arm. Another man may stand before a tree, and say, "Sure, that's a tree. It's made of wood, leaves, and once a year apples grow on its branches." If that is all he sees, then he is called a "realist." The man who truly faces up to reality sees a tree as an instrument of God's Mercy. He has the humility to see that a tree is essentially a mysterious thing with a very practical purpose. It mysteriously produces apples. Only a fool could ask, "What is an apple?" without asking, "*Why* is an apple?" No other explanation fits the phenomenon than that God has made apple trees and He sustains them so that they might give their fruit to men.

Many people have been brought to know God's Mercy by some unusual or miraculous occurrence. The shrine at Lourdes and the miracles which have taken place there have been the occasion for many conversions. Yet the Faith of centuries has not grown upon miracles. The beneficence of a father may be shown in rare acts of extraordinary kindness, but the trust of his family is earned by his generous conduct from day to day and throughout the years. The habit of Faith nurtures upon a day by day observation of God's Mercy being unfolded before our eyes. Hope for the future grows as we recall God's Mercy for us in the past, and as we count the blessings we presently enjoy. God's Mercy is always there, if we but look for it.

If you want to see God's Mercy in operation, just look at the lives of people who trust in Him. The lives of these people who have a living Faith in God are testimony to His daily concern for those who seek the Kingdom of Heaven and its Justice. These people do not debate academically about the Faith but in their very lives every one of today's false doctrines is denied.

I know a young mother who recently had a baby. She is poor and was bedded in a ward with ten other women. As is inevitable, the conversation frequently turned toward a discussion of the ways and means of preventing conception. She didn't take part in the conversation until her silence was noticed. She told them then that she had five children, she was tired but happy, knew all about contraception—including the fact that it is against the law of God, was sure that God would find it no more difficult to feed another mouth, that her husband loved her very much and she loved him, that being healthy she probably would have more children, that she was anxious to get home to her family, and if they would kindly keep quiet for a while, she would like

to say her rosary. Her remarks were greeted by silence. In thirty seconds she shattered every excuse that a woman can devise to soothe a bothered conscience, not by what she had said, mind you, but by being there with them and seeing God's Mercy where they saw disaster.

I know a young man who, as he approached marriage, was warned by his friends against it. He suffered from a serious organic trouble which demanded that he take occasional rest periods away from work. He had a semi-skilled job which brought him in \$25 a week. His strong trust in God's Providence was counted as a liability because it neutralized any worldly ambitions he might have. Notations in his bank book, covering a period of one year, soared to the considerable figure of \$40.18.

He married a Catholic girl who had the same simple trust in God as himself. They have been married almost six years and have five children. He has rarely missed a day's work, the greater part of which was manual labor—that for one period of a year and a half amounted to 68 hours a week. The children are exceptionally healthy. On the one occasion when they found themselves penniless, a diligent search unearthed a half dollar which provided them with a pint of ice cream (to celebrate their discovery) and Daddy's carfare to work.

At one time they were tempted to worry. An earnest doctor warned them that their combined blood factors were unfavorable to the birth of healthy babies. Since then medical science is faced with the problem of either revising their statistics or giving the couple a medal for accomplishing the impossible. When they moved to New York City a year ago, they put an ad in a Catholic weekly, made a novena to Mother Cabrini, and received one answer. This was an entire house which perfectly suited their need and purse.

This family has no bank account. The husband is no more desirous of wealth than before, nor has he acquired any particular facility for acquiring it. This, to my mind, is the most convincing evidence of God's Providence. Nothing here is very extraordinary, yet this family has turned up its nose at every one of the modern security axioms. Their happiness and well-being is obviously from God because that is the only place they sought it.

Just find a man who trusts in God and there you will find God. Every religious order has as its history a long testimony to God's Mercy. The greater and more absolute the trust, the more magnificent is His generosity. Mammon is the god of the slot machine economy: "Ask and you shall receive . . . what you can pay for!" Mammon, the god of insecurity to whom our present system of economics is dedicated, will always give you a nickel's worth for a nickel. But our God is a Just God and a Merciful God.

In God's Mercy there is more than enough consolation to cure all of the despair in the world. God abides with us. His love for us is limitless. His power to make that love manifest is limitless. No matter how men may by their perversity disharmonize the economy and polity of nations, God can reknit the strands they have severed so that not a hair of the head of those who trust him may be harmed.

The combined efforts of all men of good will acting apart from God can achieve nothing, but, *with God* all things are possible.

EDWARD WILLOCK



AT EVENTIDE

There's money in the bank,
The future is assured,
The car is running nicely,
My jewels are insured,
So now it would be nice,
After I have dined,
To read Rabbi Liebman
And pacify my mind.

A JOB'S A JOB

A STORY



"You rang, Mr. Atwood?" She stood on the threshold of the conference room. A dozen solemn faces looked up without interest—they were tense, preoccupied. Atwood sat at the near end of the table, his back to her. He smoked nervously. Irritably he tapped a thin pile of dittoed sheets on the corner of the table.

"Eileen—you can give these out now."

She picked up the pile, left the room. Atwood continued: "So much for Model L. Now about Model R. Roger, you and Hinchliffe tie in with . . ."

She shut the door softly. The tension in the room confirmed her suspicions. It was an axe-swinging session.

She stood in the aisle outside the door and glanced at the sheets in her hand. "Copies to: Simpson, Flynn, Gensheimer, Hubbard . . ." She scanned the text for errors—a correction showed up as a smudge. Well, here it is, gang. Read it and weep.

Cynically she surveyed the rows of desks, drawn up like battalions. Almost no one was working. Girls gossiped languidly in twos and threes. The people in Purchasing were fingering their paper-work and daydreaming. Others flipped through technical magazines or visited. Typewriters opened fire at intervals, petered out. Even the rumble of the billing machines sounded drowsy and remote, like summer thunder.

She thought: Precision Manufacturing—what a lot of sad sacks. But she knew what they were waiting for. It was pay day. On pay day at Precision, things had been happening lately. . . .

She threaded through the aisles, dropping copies of the notice on various desks.

The office stirred nervously from its lethargy. People went back to their places. Groups scattered, bunched around the bulletin, broke out in rumors.

In the middle of the room, a young man in gabardine trousers and a Barrymore shirt pushed aside a magazine, yawned mightily, and

glanced at the wall clock. Two thirty. He peered across the room toward the glass partition of Atwood's office.

"Nuts!"

He reached for his pipe. Absently he tapped the ashes into his hand, threw them under the desk. He pulled apart the stem, blew through the bit, examined the bowl. Then he fished a bent wire out of a drawer and began poking at it.

He stopped—the juice was staining his fingers. He glanced around helplessly, eyed his neighbor across the aisle.

"Fritzie—gimme a Kleenex."

The older man looked over, took in the situation, smiled gently. He pulled open a drawer, picked out two tissues from a half empty box and without comment handed them across the aisle. He smiled again, almost shyly—a small man in a dark suit—and returned to what he had been doing; he was checking off a cancellation order.

He frowned at it a moment, then wrote "File" across it, initialed it "F.G." and wearily tossed it in a letter box on the corner of his desk. The organization chart of Precision Manufacturing looked up at him through the glass top. His eye caught the caption: "Model L. Project Manager, Roger Simpson." A line dropped from it, split into two boxes. He followed the one reading "Tooling—Flynn, Gensheimer." He studied the two names.

Eileen stood between them in the aisle. "I've got something that'll interest you two."

The young man looked up, smirked lazily. "Any time, honey, you know me."

"Fresh!" She pretended offense.

Fritz glanced at her. She grinned at him glibly, flirting casually, from habit. She had a "cute figure"—she knew it. She flaunted it, an invitation and a dare. The crucifix at her throat guarded the keyhole neckline. He smiled back vaguely.

The young man asked, "What's news from the firing squad?" He jerked his thumb toward Atwood's office.

"It won't be good." She dropped a sheet on each desk. "Here's a preview." The young man leaned forward.

Fritz frowned. "Model L Production Schedule, Third Quarter." Quickly he picked over the figures. "Oct. 6,000. Nov. 2,400. Dec. 800." He paled.

Eileen was starting away. The young man swirled in his chair.

"Hold the phone, gorgeous."

"Yes?" She stepped back.

"There's a misprint."

"Don't you believe it."

"Eight *hundred*?"

"That's what the man said."

He stared moodily at the sheet. He said slowly, "That's a hell of a way to tell a guy."

"Yeah, isn't it wonderful how they do things in this place?"

"I suppose," said Fritz quietly, "there will be engrafted announcements in some pay envelopes today?"

She smiled kindly. "Could be, Fritzie."

He thought: she knows. One of us is going. Both? Something swooned inside him.

Flynn muttered to himself.

She looked at him warmly. "Don't worry about it, Chuck. It'll work out. You know—the Will of God, and stuff. . ." She hesitated, left. Her heels clacked away: tap, tap, tap.

"The Will of God. . ." repeated the young man abstractedly. Jauntiness drained out of him as the figures on the sheet stared back. Restlessly he stood up, crossed the aisle.

"Fritzie, m'boy," he announced, "it is later than we think." He drummed his knuckles on the desk.

The older man smiled. "Perhaps on this new Model R . . ."

Flynn snorted. "Yeah, like the L-2. And that plastic deal. It'll be cancelled before it's off the drawing board. Don't kid yourself, Fritz. We're out of a job." He looked with troubled eyes toward Atwood's office. "The worst of it is," he went on, half to himself, "all the shops are layin' off. . ."

"So Mr. Carver tells me," answered Fritz.

"You saw him?"

"Last night. He iss still looking."

"*You* take it pretty calm."

"When one has seen war . . . concentration camps . . ." He made a vague gesture. But the other was not paying attention. He was still looking toward the conference room.

They were silent. After a moment the older man said carefully, "It iss possible, you know."

"What's possible?" asked Flynn absently.

"That God has plans. . ."

"Plans?"

"A better job. A worsse one. None at all."

The young man stirred. "What? What?" He had lost the thread. "I'm sorry, Fritz."

"Eileen iss right," Fritz began again patiently, "you shouldn't worry."

"What d'ya expect me to do? Cartwheels?"

Fritz appraised the young man. He said without humor, "Maybe you should pray."

Flynn snickered, stopped. He thought: the man is serious. It maddened him. He stepped back from the desk.

"Look, Fritz—with me a job's a job, see? That's all. I don't know anything about . . ." He broke off, tried to smile away his irritation. "It's no use, Fritzie," he went on in a different tone. "I can't sweat out that bull session any longer. I'll go nuts. I'm going out in the shop. If the paymaster comes while I'm gone, put me on the auto-call, willya?" He strode up the aisle rapidly.

The older man watched him go. He headed for the door to the plating room. A girl crossed his path; she must have dropped a remark—he was stopping. The exchange did not last long. He was backing away, laughing—they were both laughing now—he was moving toward the door again, his head and shoulders bobbing along behind a row of file cabinets.

The older man put his elbows on the desk and cupped his chin in his hands. The words came back to him: "It's no use, Fritzie. . . A job's a job, see?" He frowned to himself. Why was he always so futile? Why didn't Flynn listen?

The difficulty of the language? He wondered if he had said something wrong. Do they have such words in English? He had hardly ever heard such things discussed among Americans, except cynically. It struck him again: even the young people go to church here, but they do not believe in God.

And yet . . . to the young there is no death. Each love affair, each job, is an ultimate. One would think they could see the hand of God in everything.

Thinking of his companion, he looked over at his desk, imagined him in his seat. The dismembered pipe lay where the young man had left it. He could see him cleaning it—scowling, squirming in his chair, crossing and uncrossing his legs, rummaging absurdly through drawers, flailing his nerves into ribbons over the simple task, as he was now doing over the fear of being sacked.

His eye caught the Vargas calendar next to the pipe; he ceased his gentle game of caricature. Flynn had shown it to him in glee. The couplet in gilt letters on the frame had shocked him:

"Backward, turn backward, O Time, in thy flight—
Make me a boy again, just for tonight!"

He had translated it with such difficulty . . . He was fourteen, they were living in Meiningen, before they had moved to Erfurt; and as the thoughts became German, the classroom had receded from him, and he had conjured up all the magic that America might be; the im-

mense space, the drowsing cows, the solitary boys fishing up lazy, clear rivers, the freedom. . .

"Pretty sharp, eh?" He had handed it back to Flynn without comment, his heart full of pain that the nostalgic little poem should have been thus twisted to the snicker of a roué's regret. Flynn had caught the look, he had pouted, his fun had been spoiled.

Now he could feel only compassion for Flynn. His failure to reach him was not due to lack of words. It was merely too late.

He thought of the plaster statuette one of the office girls had brought in for a laugh. It was of a child of about fourteen. She stood with downcast eyes, her arms locked behind her, one sandal stepping on the other, a swollen figure of shame. On the base of the statue, "Kilroy was here."

Everything, everywhere, a symbol. Impurity settled on them like sand, they breathed it. He felt the tyranny of evil. It seemed improbable that Flynn would ever see the Will of God in as many places as he saw sex or money or good living. "A job's a job, see?"

The paymaster had come in. He worked his way slowly among the desks, dropping envelopes that were quickly torn open. . . Atwood came out of the conference room. His captains fanned out behind him, returning to their companies. . . the billing machines set up a barrage.

As the paymaster advanced toward him, fear quickened his breath. He found it hard to consider this fat, hot, preoccupied little man as the arm of the Lord. He pondered the sincerity of his own words, "Maybe you should pray." He could think of no prayers. He could think only of his wife, his bank balance, the bleak walls of employment offices. His hands were moist. He knotted them in an attitude of prayer. He closed his eyes, bit his thumb. . .

The fat man thought he was asleep.

"Hey, Fritz!"

The German looked up, embarrassed.

"What iss the good word?" he asked sheepishly.

"Save yer money," answered the fat man with a grin, dropping an envelope on his desk. The German looked startled. The fat man moved on.

* * *

"Mr. Charles Flynn. Mr. Charles Flynn."

The loudspeakers carried it all over the shop.

"—and not only that, the chrome peeled all off in six months. No sir, I don't want no Chevvie." George, the foreman of Sub-Assembly, stood shaking his head, not wanting no Chevvie.

"Oh God, there's Fritzie!" The young man ran for a phone.

"Flynn?" It was Simpson.

"Yes, sir."

"Where are ya?"

"Trouble-shooting, out in assembly."

"You are like hell. Come in here, I wanna see ya." The receiver went dead.

He stood by the timekeeper's phone, frowning and pulling at his lip. Then he sighed, smirked irritably and doggedly set off for the office.

"Yeah, yeah, I know. I don't care whether they're checked or not, I want all the Model R prints you got. . . I know, but I can't start cuttin' stock and layin' out tools till you boys. . ."

Simpson sat like an animated Buddha, barking into his phone, his jowls slapping on his neck. His pig eyes fixed Flynn, motioned him to a chair. He continued his abuse into the mouthpiece.

The young man sat down, tugged at his tie, slumped into a relaxed attitude, thought better of it and leaned forward respectfully. Simpson slammed down the receiver, swivelled in his chair. He spoke rapidly.

"Chuck, Model L is kaput as of Christmas."

"So I've heard," the young man muttered.

"We're making a few changes in the organization."

"Oh?" He wondered if this was . . .

"Model R is breakin' loose. It's gonna be a sweetheart. I'm headin' up the project. I'm puttin' you in charge of tooling. We got four months to get into production, so you gotta get the lead out. It's crazy, but it's what the Old Man wants. Here." He shoved a handful of drawings at him. "These are all I can scare out of Engineering. Rough out your dies, get your orders on tool design, start your load chart for the press room. Pete Benson'll be workin' under you. Better get together with him. . . Hello?" He had picked up the phone. "Gimmie material control." He had already dismissed Flynn. He muttered to himself, "Phosphor bronze! Where the hell—Hello, Bill?"

The young man stumbled out into the office. Eileen came over. She had seen him leave Simpson.

"Hiya, honey!" He beamed broadly. "I'm in!" He flicked her nose with his fistful of drawings. "I'm on the Model R!"

"Good for you," she said, without joy.

He feigned disappointment. "Where's my big kiss?"

"It's in the works," she answered, without interest.

"What's the matter?"

"Fritzie. . ." she looked off across the office.

With a twinge, he remembered that Simpson had said nothing about Fritz.

"Cheer him up, will ya?" She walked away.

Slowly, he walked back to his place. What can you say to a guy like Fritz, when . . .? As he drew nearer to the grey head, bent over the desk, he became conscious of the prints in his hand—Model R. He hesitated, tossed them on his desk, ambled over to his companion.

The envelope lay open. The pink slip was beside it.

"Fritzie, I . . ."

"Congratulations." Fritz looked up at him, smiled faintly.

"You heard?"

"The grapevine," he explained. He seemed amused. "Don't look so unhappy, Chuck. This iss a good break for you."

Flynn studied the floor. "Eileen just told me . . ." he began.

Fritz said quickly, "I don't mind, you know. I really don't."

"Gee, Fritz, I'm sorry."

"Why? A job iss a job, that iss all. Isn't that what you say? It iss good to be reminded of that, sometimes."

"What do you mean?"

"Oh, one forgets so easy. . . One iss fooled into thinking of all thiss as . . . well, safe, secure, beyond pain. And all the time, all ofer the world . . . there iss starvation, despair, much suffering. It iss good, sometimes, to be without, to be cut off, to be joined for a while with thosse others. Perhaps God is reminding me that there iss no security anywhere, really . . ."

"Is that all you got to think about when you're out of a job?" Flynn was exasperated.

Fritz looked thoughtful. He answered, "It iss enough."

The young man fidgeted. "Look, Fritz, I know the chief engineer over at Rite-Way. Why don'tcha—" His phone began ringing. "Oh, hell, excuse me, willya? Look, I'll be right back." He darted across the aisle, grappled for the receiver.

"Chuck?"

"Right." It was Simpson again.

"Dawson tells me we need a new press. Says the Erie isn't big enough for the deep draws. I wantcha to check into it right away. Find out if you can cobb!e up something that'll fit in the Erie. If not . . ."

The voice barked instructions. Chuck fished for a pencil, scribbled notes on a pad as he listened. In the corner of his eye, he could see Fritz watching him. The old man looked sad, hurt.

Flynn thought: poor devil!

Simpson talked on.

NEIL MACCARTHY

THE ANATOMY OF DESPAIR

A philosophical lion—who presumably expressed the views of his kind—once observed that few big-game hunts have been considered from the lion's standpoint. In this matter, we are inclined to an understandable bias which seems, significantly enough, to stem from the first records of paleolithic man. Yet, it is conceivable that that viewpoint could make a very great difference. We find much the same difficulty when the "northern races" look down upon the ways of the "Latins." Consider the shiftless Mexican fruit-vendor, who will close shop immediately his morning's supply is sold, even if the first customer should buy the lot. This dismays his Yankee neighbor, to whom the course inevitable and instinctive would be to hustle more fruit, his mind already awake to distant possibilities and visions of Farmers Market. Even without reading the advertisements, he knows that "the future belongs to those who prepare for it."

What appears to be a lack of industry and initiative may be something altogether different. It may be another viewpoint, expressing a tradition that seems to have been accepted at one time rather uncritically. Victor Hugo had the idea when he lectured Napoleon: "No, Sire. The future belongs to God." Though the details of the thing might often have been hazy, it was generally agreed that if a man paid close attention to a few present matters over which he had been given control, certain greater matters, over which he had no control, would be managed to his well-being, even despite his own clumsy bungling.

If the future really belongs to those who prepare for it, the present owners are in great danger of dispossession. If the future belongs to those who prepare for it, insurance and sureties, the bureaus of planned economy, social security, old age pensions, and unemployment compensation have made it ours thrice over. And yet the title is not as clear as we could wish. Preparation seems to leave us constantly unprepared. Some future archeologist possessed of an inquiring mind may, in the rubble of ancient New York, discover this morning's newspaper, thereby solving a puzzling point of history, for it is there we find the strange assurance that America has enough atom bombs to destroy the world. Signs admit of the possibility that the post-war world's salvation is not the altogether certain thing we had anticipated. The results of the planning are not always in the plans.

If from all this, with that logic-chopping for which we Christians are notorious, we conclude that perhaps the future doesn't belong to us after all, the alternate tradition might be worth our casual examination. It springs from certain much-praised words in which some have thought to find something more than a fine piece of poetry.

Do not be anxious for your life, what you shall eat; nor yet for your body, what you shall put on. Is not the life a greater thing than the food, and the body than the clothing? Look at the birds of the air, they do not sow, or reap, or gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are not you of much more value than they? But which of you by being anxious about it can add to his stature a single cubit? And as for clothing, why are you anxious? See how the lilies of the field grow; they neither toil nor spin, yet I say to you that not even Solomon in all his glory was arrayed like one of these. But if God so clothes the grass of the field, which today is alive and tomorrow is thrown into the oven, how much more you, O you of little faith! Therefore do not be anxious, saying, "What shall we eat?", or, "What shall we drink?", or, "What are we to put on?" (for after all these things the Gentiles seek); for your Father knows that you need all these things. But seek first the kingdom of God and his justice, and all these things shall be given you besides. Therefore do not be anxious about tomorrow; for tomorrow will have anxieties of its own. Sufficient for the day is its own trouble.

As this remains an untried ideal, the practicality of its literal application has not been precisely determined. Quite apart from this consideration, however, we may be certain that such an application, if there were any danger of it, would be, broadly speaking, a moral impossibility. The Christian can hardly avoid the complicated business of living in the world today as we have made it. We may be excused of mere facetiousness in asserting that modern man is pretty thoroughly fettered in stocks and bonds.

Christian tradition, however, has never maintained that we ought not prepare for the future, though it has been known to be touchy on the question of ownership. We have been given the virtue of prudence for the regulation of the secondary causes through which God customarily dispenses His providence in men's lives. Holy Scripture consequently admonishes the sluggard to garner wisdom from the ant, who in summer lays up food that he may have whereof to eat in the winter. Christ and the Apostles carried with them a supply of money for whatever needs might arise, and over this they appointed one as treasurer (possibly as a salutary lesson to bankers).

Back in the days when such matters were taken seriously, men set their minds to determine the extent to which they ought to be concerned over the goods of the earth. St. Thomas is the "common doctor" who may be considered the voice of Christian tradition, and he thought

that a distinction should be made. "No good work is virtuous," he wrote, "lest clothed in the proper circumstances, among which is the proper time, for as it is written (in Ecclesiastes), 'There is a time and an opportunity for every work'—now this is applied not only to exterior works, but also to our internal solicitude." A man sows seed in anticipation of the harvest, he takes every precaution to insure a bountiful return, careful of everything in turn, for each occupation in season is a present concern. But the harvest itself will become an object of his care in harvest time, not before. All this is to regulate temporal goods in the providence of God. Not only in making worldly matters an end in themselves do we misuse them (a possibility not unheard of today), but also if we uselessly seek them beyond all necessity, and if we make them the object of a constant solicitude. "Temporal goods were made subject to man that he might use them for his necessities, not that he should find an end in them, or that he should vainly worry about them." Screwtape explained to Wormwood how a certain dear old lady, who ate very little food, was by her picayune preoccupation with what she did eat a great glutton. When a man works to provide his family with necessities and a measure of temporal security, he labors well. But just as a system that forces his whole attention to subsistence will be a wrong system, so, a society that has put its trust in the multiplication and double-checking of "secondary causes," denying outright or at least forgetting the owner of the future to which they are supposedly directed, is a society that has gone wrong. It is the confused wake of an initial and general sin of despair. If a man who professes belief in a provident God labors with the view of making himself self-sufficient just in case—as though Peter had donned waterwings before striding forth upon the Sea of Galilee—it is the sin against hope.

The early Reformers stood aghast before the wild freedom of the human will and its consequent implications of individual responsibility toward a hypothetically uncertain destiny. They pronounced dead and quietly laid to rest the courage and adventure that had made for Western civilization, and settled back into the oldest and most terrible of the slaveries that had opposed the rise of Christianity. Because certainty was not vouchsafed by the Christian God Who demanded hope in His predestination, they sought it in a fate that enslaved their will. Despair has proved to be the most fecund of the superstitions. The promised race arose that was to cry: "Give us bread. Take our freedom!" Rather than trust in a Father Who provides for His children who are seeking the kingdom of heaven, we have lusted for the security of fixed and inexorable economic laws, for which we have sacrificed the personal liberties which were the heritage of Christianity. With

the promise of economic security, we have been lured to the regimen of the anthill, asking only a comfortable serfdom.

Despair is a lady that deceives. If a man thinks by tugging at his own bootstraps to set himself beyond the transience of this life and be at rest, he has been played for a fool. Instead of attaining peace, he has undertaken a ceaseless activity, dissipated because without direction, doomed to frustration through an attempt to create the uncreatable. God retains a firm grip on the future, despite all the sleep we may lose over it. Whence it arises, Charles Peguy has said, that God does not like men who do not like sleep. It is an activity that breeds activity forever, a despair that breeds despair. It is a superstition that enjoys its last grim triumph when at last the quaint Christian notion that material things were created for man is reversed, and man is bidden to order himself to their inexorable laws. So Margaret Sanger sternly advises the stoppage of all human reproduction for a decade—not only as a punishment for the criminal nations who after all brought the war and all that sort of thing on themselves, but also as a discipline for the victors who have made the world once again free.

In our society, an aging parent often can have recourse only to a meager state pension; social security affords a substitute for charity and justice. The individual Christian may not be able to swim free of this complicated maelstrom, but he knows that God, and not economics, is the unchanging. We may have to humor the process, but we must not take it seriously. We do not take spoiled children seriously when they reach for the moon, and the preposterous jargon and pomposity of finance is, when all is said and done, very much like the prattle of slightly impossible children.

What has the Christian in common with a world that refuses to believe and to hope, but must make its own certainties? We cannot have infallible certainty of even the state of our grace. Death itself, aside from a kindly revelation, is scientifically only a probability. In that crazy paradox so ill-suited to the serious soberness needed by the man who is to get ahead, it is only in the uncertainty of Christian living that we may find certainty. Only in the unknown mind of God is peace and security. Humility continues to exalt a man, poverty goes quietly about delivering into his hands the lasting wealth. The divine sense of humor is a beautiful thing. But it is never funny.

*Why should we falter? Ours shall be the mirth
And yours the amaze, when you have thinned away
Your starving serfs to fit their starveling pay—
And seen the meek inheriting the earth!*

BRUCE VAWTER, C.M.

BUILDERS IN VAIN

"Unless the Lord build the house . . ."

According to any General Motors' vice-president, the Assembly Line is the greatest thing since Prometheus pulled a fast one on the inhabitants of Olympus. If I were one of the gaskets or spark plugs or bearings turned out so efficiently via A. L., I might agree with the honorable vice-president. I am, however, actually conscious of the fact that I am made in the image and likeness of God. My awareness of this noble heritage informs me with resentment for the Assembly Line which has overflowed its industrial banks to encroach upon the spiritual sphere. The moral implications of this phenomenon are epitomized in that grandiloquent catch-phrase, "human engineering," with all its connotations of life according to blueprint and slide rule and the sharpened pencil. As an "inmate" of government housing for several years, I have been "engineered" to the point of eruption—and this protest constitutes a safety valve.

I have discovered that behind the Utopian facade of its several material advantages (termed "the fat of the land" by the uninitiated), life in a government housing project—and I have lived in more than one—has preponderant disadvantages which all the functional apartments and electric refrigerators and landscaped playgrounds from Greenbelt to Candlestick Cove cannot offset. The days of the uncooperative budget and the balky stove have gone—but they have taken with them the kind of living in which one's personal integrity is not forever under siege by a thousand abnormally demoralizing influences.

In the Hopeful Thirties, the Rural Resettlement Administration under Technocrat Rex Tugwell, initiated the first wide-scale program of government subsidy of housing in the United States. The project was conceived, undoubtedly, in a lovely aura of idealism amid much talk about improving the lot of the "underprivileged." The program was postulated on the theory that the answer to human ills can be found by relieving material wants. It forgot that you cannot transplant people as though they were primroses along the traditional path. It forgot or, more probably, did not know that the stone of philanthropy is indigestible fare and that only the good bread of Christian charity contains all the vitamins essential to true happiness.

Even this half-a-loaf ethos of philanthropy was abandoned when the impact of war upon the nation's industry necessitated the acceleration of home building for war-workers. Housing became, primarily, a military and economic means of implementing the effectiveness of the State. The State wanted the welders and riggers and machinists close to the factories and the shipyards—not because commuting long distances is inconvenient to these workers but because it impairs their

efficiency and thus shows up in red ink on the profit-and-loss sheets.

The current stagnation in home building, a national scandal, appears to be attributable to the fact that the law makers have retained this militaristic concept and short-sightedly continue to concentrate only on the issues of proximate expediency in the interests of the State. The simple motivation of the desire to provide homes for the homeless to atone for the homelessness of the Infant Jesus who found no room in the inn at Bethlehem, fails to carry sufficient force to spur our solons to solve the housing problem. The present policy, as during the war, is to consider the benefits accruing to tenants as a by-product, not an end per se. The housing problem remains a political and economic issue. Its moral aspects are ignored.

A government housing project is predicated on a philosophy of Procrustean adaption. You fit rigid rules without having anything more than a nominal part in their formulation. The qualifications for residence are mainly economic which means that within limited variations, all above the floor of indigence, all residents are in the same economic bracket. This automatically creates the tendency to become self-sufficient for there is no immediate challenge to the practice of charity that is evoked by the presence of the poor. This condition, in turn, breeds selfishness and its correlative materialism. Keeping up with the Joneses has never been the vice of the very poor—but in a community where there are no poor, the class distinctions, though marked off by a hair, are sharply drawn in vertical rather than horizontal lines. The materialistic concept which life in a housing project engenders crops out in the limitation of families, for housing architects evidently consider the three-bedroom family abnormally prolific. Further abetting the trend toward a materialistic rather than spiritual interpretation of life, the fluctuations of population make what Mrs. Grundy says of small concern. Morality, of course, is not based on what the neighbors think but with the decline of respect for social sanctions, there is a corresponding disintegration of the respect for moral sanctions as well. You mind your own business. The cry of Cain becomes the watchword. You disclaim any responsibility for the welfare of your neighbor . . . a line of thinking evolving from the fact that both of you are cogs in an economic regime. And cogs do not fraternize. The preservation of personal integrity against these odds becomes a losing battle. Most tragic aspect of this defeat is the unawareness of the loser that his loss *is* tragic. For, although he would chafe at the pressure of Christ's cross, he bears the "cross of gold" blithely.

The pursuit of spirituality was never easy. It is made even tougher in a housing project—for the usual obstacles are artificially aggravated. Pragmatic and expedient action, at first repugnant, gradually becomes acceptable. Under the essentially dictatorial regime, it's "put-up-or-

shut-up"! For where is the man so brave as to bother to go down fighting for his principles against a system that always wins? Who is there to cut the Gordian knot of government bureaus whose administrative intricacies have long since descended to the stockpile of cartoonists and radio comedians? Inside looking out, by the way, the humor is more grim than in the spirit of good, clean fun.

In one of the housing projects in which I lived, there was a system of concessions which made it illegal for a private group of residents to hire its own instructor in craftwork or dancing or sewing. You had to use the instructors provided by the official community education board. This board even protested the formation of a Catholic Youth Club on the grounds that this constituted unfair competition with the official, secular program for youth recreation. You were also forbidden to keep goldfish without a permit. They think of everything! Only the pressure of business like this has kept them from seeing whether I swept under the beds this morning (I didn't!).

Save on paper, where they look fine, there are no practical instruments of appeal from either grave or captious dicta. The sanctions that result make conformity more prudent. You can be asked to move. Murmuring, "They can't do this to me!", you find they've already done it.

Life in a housing project is a conscious Marking Time against an unpredictable morrow—and by "morrow" I mean the Tuesday that follows a specific Monday! As long as the qualifications for residence are dependent upon economic status and/or usefulness, you do not say, "Here are the acres I shall pass on to my sons!"

When you plant morning glory seeds, you cross your fingers, hoping you'll be around when the blue trumpet-like flowers make music out of color and their intimation of God's love. You cling, for moral support, to the one idea that this present living is a protracted camping trip and, in consequence, the household gods get little meet adoration. To relax and admit this to be home, is to be lost. For Home is somewhere else. The sense of insecurity becomes, paradoxically, the one security against your capitulation to the life of an automaton to which the ideology of the bureaucratic commissars, in effect if not in intention, would have you conform.

The devil's advocate plays fair, they say. And there is one phase of life in government housing which has immense potentialities for the improvement of the social order. This is in the area of race relations. As an example, take the Southerner who moves into a government housing project. He brings along with him his lifelong prejudices against his Negro brothers in Christ. He finds himself in a community where, for the first time in his life, he has to compete with the Negro on equal terms on the job, at the movies, on buses. He

finds, to his surprise, that not all people think as he does, and he has to whitewash his leopard's spots of fancied superiority. His prejudices may be too deep-seated for complete eradication—but he has to submit them to discipline and control. It happens like this.

In one of the California shipyards, a man was killed in a fall into the drydock. The workers on the bus were discussing the tragedy when one Texan drawled, "Why all the fuss? It was only another burr-head!"

Quietly, another man answered the cruel question, "Sure, only another *man*."

The Texan blushed. Even this is progress along a difficult and slow journey.

I've been living in a community where I've experienced a foretaste of life in the totalitarian pattern. I, at least, have the freedom to leave it. What then must life be like where there are bars that prevent escape, and where the administration is not in the spirit of misguided benevolence but in that of calculated exploitation?

Congressman John Taber recently made some startling disclosures on the extent of Communist infiltration into government housing agencies. I know that if I were a Communist, I'd say, "What a sweet set-up!" and roll up my sleeves.

I've been R32A for four years. I've taken walks down blocks and blocks of houses exactly like my own. My husband goes to work when everyone else does at wages everyone else gets. Our jobs, our interests, our recreation, converge with those of every other family around us. Many of us have already come to accept plenty of hot water and dependable garbage collection as the ultimate in the Good Life. But underneath it all, we are a wandering people who have not yet crossed over into the Promised Land. In the ideological desert in which we are encamped, we eat an ersatz manna.

I miss the kind of a community where there's a friendly grocer who gives candy to the children just before dinner. I miss Mrs. Murphy down the street who has an uncanny intuition about sending up a pie when old friends drop in unexpectedly, and adding water to the soup won't fill the breach in the menu. There are no old friends in housing projects.

Life in a government housing project is sterile and devoid of the integrity and significance which only a Christian philosophy can provide. It will remain thus, pending the substitution of charity which now subserves economics and expediency.

Life like this is reminiscent of the one Aldous "Alpha Plus" Huxley envisioned in his blueprint for a "Brave New World." When society gets around to applying his assembly-line technique for the procreation of the race, the resulting human being will be just the type to identify happiness and the collective mediocrity of life by government

1.



... AND JESUS SAID "COME"

3.



**BUT WHEN HE SAW THE STRONG
WIND, HE WAS AFRAID, AND AS HE
BEGAN TO SINK HE CRIED OUT,
SAYING, "LORD SAVE ME!"**

FOUR ACTS

2.



**THEN PETER GOT OUT OF THE
BOAT AND WALKED ON THE WATER**

4.



**... AND JESUS AT ONCE STRETCHED
FORTH HIS HAND AND TOOK HOLD OF HIM.**

APOSTATES' HARVEST

Anyone who spends much time traveling about London, or any other large industrial town, with his eyes open, will be struck by the fact that most people live either in slums or in the next thing to them.

By slums I do not necessarily mean premises which would be condemned by the sanitary authorities, but depressing regions in which one must live in a makeshift manner, cramped and sordid. Generally, one has no room for more than the barely necessary operations of living, and there is neither time nor space for the graces. The term may be applied to many blocks of new flats and to miles of streets of eighteenth and nineteenth-century houses, built for people of substance and now let off in rooms and tenements. In the latter you have little privacy and in the former no room.

Our observer will also notice that nine people out of ten are ugly. All, that is, except children and some fresh, pretty girls who are unspoilable. These people are ugly in themselves, and their clothes make them look even worse. If anything, the more expensive clothes are worse than the makeshift ones worn by the real slum dwellers, as those have a certain gaudy charm which has not yet been refined out of them. Your really respectable city dweller is not ugly with the pungent, racy ugliness which inspired Hogarth and Cruikshank, Dickens and the artists who carved gargoyles on medieval cathedrals. They are just drab, shoddy and characterless. They live in drab streets, travel daily packed like sardines in a tube, and earn their living in monotonous and unfruitful work. In the evening they return home and dope their sorrows with novels, films, dance music, spirits and spooning in corners. True, a few will stand for hours to hear a symphony concert, or see the ballet, or take a day in the country. Some go cycling and hiking at week ends—in large parties. A few go by themselves or in twos and threes. True, every now and then we buy up a tract of lovely country and preserve it for the nation, or a lovely house and turn it into a museum, if we can find the money, but beauty, even when it has lip service and does not interfere with efficiency, is an expensive and a luxury. To most people life is ugly and lived in ugly surroundings. That is Real Life. And I am not here even thinking of the crowded houses, the hollow shells too far damaged to repair, the streets that have not been painted since 1939, the open spaces in the city choked with weeds.

This ugliness is not a new phenomenon. It has been with us now for years. Even the insides of Catholic churches are ugly enough to make a convert of even average taste gasp. If a priest, greatly daring, procures pictures or statues by a responsible and competent artist, the cry is raised that these are not devotional. I have often wondered in

what this quality consists. In practice it appears to involve poor craftsmanship, similarity to every other statue one has ever seen, and complete absence of verisimilitude or thought. To be devotional it seems that a work must be mass-produced, shoddy, and guaranteed not to provoke ideas of any kind. It is a horrid thought but I believe people really like their ugliness. Before the war at least you could buy pretty things in gay colors as cheaply as drab ones, and yet many people preferred to be drab.

I have often wondered if this was always so. I think probably not. Ugliness there has always been, but I fancy it was incidental, not ubiquitous. The sixteenth-century religious wars were incredibly ugly, but more local than those of the nineteenth century. I have been told that in Hogarth's London there were slums worse than any we have now for sheer filth, but a city dweller could take a piece of bread and cheese in his pocket and go for a walk among green fields and hawthorn hedges, hear the cuckoo, pick primroses and sleep under the stars. Ugliness was an incident in his life. It did not hem him in on every side. Even now it has not trapped everyone. I remember my suburban childhood; picnics on the common, evenings by the fire, children's parties, and Sundays in the garden, and they are good to remember. But if a young couple expects a little house and garden all to themselves now they are met with a stare of shocked surprise that they should dare to hope for what other people have not. Apparently if "other people" haven't a thing you must not want it. If no one has it you lose the right to it. One day we shall have a whole generation to whom Communism looks like a rosy dream, as it has long looked to the industrial poor.

How did we come to this? Most people would say the Industrial Revolution, but that is too easy. How did we bring such a horror on ourselves and how can we overcome it? I do not think the invention of machinery alone would have produced this enormous evil nor that a return to simple living alone would cure it. You cannot unscramble an egg, and you cannot uninvent a machine. If we banned them forthwith it is doubtful whether we should be much better off. In every walk of life there is a divorce between truth and beauty. Most people speak as though they could not be reconciled. If you hear that an author tells the whole truth about a subject you know at once that it will be ugly truth. A realistic writer is always a dealer in mud, corpses and sin. Beauty is a luxury and an extra—tolerated as long as it keeps people quiet, unworthy of the attention of serious persons. They are too busy with their politics.

This was the attitude of the men who built and developed the industrial civilization. Art and all that was very well for women and effeminate. Let them have their pretty toys. Men must occupy them-

selves with such serious matters as cheating in business, lying about politics and suppressing revolt. They were largely extreme Protestants, the children of the Puritans who defaced the medieval churches, drove all the joy and beauty out of religion and frightened more people away from Christianity than any other body of people that ever lived. The Borgias were nothing to them. Under them we grew to mistrust the beauty of Catholic ceremony (so pagan), the graciousness of Catholic devotion (how decadent), and the delicacy of Catholic morals (how disingenuous). We learned to mistrust beauty and grace and tenderness and to believe it to be first a seduction, then a luxury. Even Catholics are not entirely free from it. In most people's minds there is a connection between piety and gloom, piety and ugliness, piety and the wet blanket. A cruder and saner age than ours (sometimes known as the Dark Ages) looked on sadness and despondency as a fault—even a sin. The Desert Fathers had a great deal of practical advice on combatting accidia—or, in modern language, the blues.

Now the spirit of gloom has disguised itself as love of the truth, that of phlegm as balance, mental laziness as humility, and you may reform the social order till you are black in the face, the next one bids fair to be as bad as this in time. For the shadow of the Puritans has settled down on us like a bad smell, and though we have outgrown their clothes the shadow and the smell remain behind. While it is with us, anyone who wants to open the windows and let in a new idea is a trouble maker; if he has ideals based on principles he is difficult, and a woman with brains who is so rash as to use them (oh, abomination of desolation) does not "fit in." Catholics are tolerated now—so long as they are indistinguishable from pagans, but most people would be less shocked at your living with a man than at your explaining your Faith from a soap box at the street corner. One often wonders whether the saints would have "fitted in."

Gradually all vitality, all character is being ironed out of the human race. He (or still more she) who is not cut to the approved pattern or prepared to be molded to it is not wanted, does not get on, slips out and is forgotten. He is queer, difficult, does not fit in. To a certain extent this must always have been so, but there seems once to have been more relish for oddities and more tolerance, and certainly more respect, for character as distinct from mere usefulness. Did that amiable quality, respect for man as such and enjoyment of him as he is and not with reference to his use to one's self, go out with religious dogma? Or has it perhaps not quite gone out? They are still to be found among the poor and the outsiders, these eccentrics who do not fit in. They are of no practical use, and they are swept into a corner where they cannot get in the way.

It is becoming increasingly evident that without dogmatic religion, and the Catholic is the only dogmatic religion that is not covered with mildew by now, beauty and truth do not walk together. To the Puritan and his offspring beauty is vain and truth unpalatable. Most people have forgotten that there should ever be a connection between the two and raise the cry of "wishful thinking" should truth by chance be sweet. Created beauty should have led us to truth, and truth to Eternal Beauty, but they feel that medicine, to be of any use, must be nasty and they become heathens instead—and talk as if there were something very noble about this bleak lack of faith.

One wonders how any cure is to be administered. Perhaps it will be started by those who break away from the machine and start afresh, perhaps by those who, unable to leave the machine, stay in it. An idea that has always fascinated me is that of a soul who achieves holiness in the machine and as part of it, in no way cut off from other cogs, or unlike them as far as anyone can see; of that spirit spreading like wildfire through the whole inhuman structure of a society that means to turn men into dummies; of holiness breaking out and laughing at the monster which tries to drain the life out of our souls. I can imagine that its first hold might be among the misfits and the unsuccessful, among those who are branded as unsuitable material for promotion—obscure folks only known to a few friends, but spreading everywhere, till there was not a man or woman who had not known at least one of them. I can imagine the Young Christian Workers operating in this way, but the plan might be extended to include Old Christian Pensioners as well—queer old maids relegated to back bedrooms and carefully forgotten by their friends, and seedy unsuccessful men who have lost their chance now of having families of their own or who have lost them. I think they would not be a very respectable gathering and they might be a very odd one, but these odd people might have the holy lightheartedness of the saints, a lightheartedness spreading like sparks from a conflagration, lighting here and there and breaking out into new fires everywhere till the planned and standardized world, the planners' paradise and the prison of men and women, would seem to burst into flame and be shaken down by the laughter of regenerated men. And then we shall be able to begin.

C. M. LARKINS
London, England

THE FRYING PAN AND THE FIRE

Either for God or against God—that is once more the point at issue, and upon it hangs the fate of the world. For in every department of life, in politics and economics, in the sciences and the arts, in the state and domestic life, in the East and in the West, everywhere the same issue arises. (Encyclical "Caritate Christi Compulsi," 1932)

Confusion and disorder in contemporary political and economic thought have assumed Promethean proportions; it would seem that we are living in another, modern tower of Babel. The tongues are many: the marxism of the radicals, the socialism of the liberals, big business echoing Adam Smith, these and many others, and many shades of each. But in this chorus one dialect dominates, collectivism, whether it be called centralization, socialism or planned economy. We have *PM*, the *New Republic* and the *Nation* to assure us that Europe is headed for socialism, and it can hardly be doubted that for some time we have been witnessing a steady drift away from the conception of society and state taught us by classical liberalism. The reaction from individualism to a state-dominated policy and economy was strong, and it has been hastened immeasurably by the war; under war-time conditions capitalism has almost ceased to function (planning by the state has displaced it) and now, at the close of the European war, we see England nearly socialized, in France we hear plans for the nationalization of industry, while Russia, the most gigantic collectivist state in history, dominates the continent, its influence spreading far beyond its actual conquests. Then too, at the beginning of the war we saw the omnipotent statism of Germany and Italy.

But for all that the outcome is far from clear. The liberals are already crying that the peace is being lost to the reactionaries, and certainly we are witnessing a desperate counterattack by the proponents of classical politics and economics, the advocates of free trade and a competitive economy. Capitalism too is not without its able defenders; Frederick Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom*, which has raised such a storm of controversy, both in England where it was first published, and in this country, is a frontal attack on socialistic collectivism. His book may profitably be taken as a focusing point for this discussion, both because it is so well known and because it defends so ably an important position in contemporary political and economic thought. It has frequently been said in recent times that the most important problem to be faced today is the problem of a planned economy.

IT SEEMS CLEAR THAT CAPITALISM WILL NEVER REGAIN ITS FORMER PLACE; WHAT THEN IS TO TAKE ITS PLACE? Liberal thought is unanimous in declaring that socialism

provides the only solution. Now the Popes have unequivocally maintained that socialism is totally unacceptable to Catholic thought. Nor did they mean, as some have asserted, that socialism is to be rejected only insofar as it is connected with atheism and the denial of Christian morality, but acceptable in the measure that it is a purely economic doctrine. Christian thinkers, then, have a strong obligation to assist in the clarification of thought on this vital problem. In this paper we use Mr. Hayek's book purely as a matter of convenience, as a means of localizing the arguments for and against a planned economy. Our concern is to establish the metaphysical and theological assumptions underlying both the capitalist and socialist positions. In so doing, we shall make clear the metaphysical doctrine underlying the Catholic position. Too often discussions of this economic problem proceed by totally ignoring the doctrinal assumptions which govern conclusions in the fields of economics and politics; this is to be expected in an age which is ignorant of the role of metaphysical and theological wisdom in governing and ordering the lower sciences. We may expect this in those outside the Church. But that there has been no such investigation by Catholics to date is truly an astonishing fact. It is not surprising, then, that Catholic economists have been led to wonder whether socialism as an economic system may not be acceptable to Catholics. We shall attempt to establish that socialism, precisely as a purely economic solution, and considered in abstraction from its denial of morality, rests upon a fundamentally false metaphysical position and consequently cannot lead to a just state. In so doing we will show that the Papal solution is the only solution which will ensure a just social order as it alone is governed by the true metaphysics.

The Capitalist Position

The thesis of *The Road to Serfdom* is familiar. Hayek, an Austrian economist who lived through the Nazi rise to power, is convinced that the democracies are traveling along the same road already traversed by the totalitarian states. In his opinion it is the liberals who are unwittingly leading us to totalitarianism. Simply his argument is this: socialism, that is, any sort of central direction or planning, leads inevitably to the tyranny of dictatorship. For practical purposes he equates socialism with collectivism.

The key to Hayek's thought is his absolute dichotomy between a competitive economy and a centralized dictatorship; in his view there is no middle ground between these two positions, any middle position being merely the first step toward the complete central planning of a dictatorship. Any effort to replace the autonomous controls of a free society by direction from above is bound to lead to tyranny. Thus he sees but two alternatives: a free competitive economy, or central direction, i.e. planning. (He uses "planning" to mean "planning against

competition," or "planning to replace competition" in contradistinction to a type of planning of which he approves, planning to provide the widest scope and most effective field for competition.)

Thus Hayek's position may be summarized in three points: first, there is his absolute conviction that authority inevitably becomes tyranny; second, and following from the first, an absolute dichotomy between a competitive economy and a central dictatorship; and third, his belief that economic dictatorship brings with it political dictatorship.

The position is a generalization drawn from historical instances, for the most part founded on analysis of modern states. The fact as such is inescapable: modern authoritarian states have for the most part become tyrannies. Political freedom does usually go when the state assumes direct control of the economic system. But does such a generalization have an absolute value? IS THERE A NECESSARY CONNECTION BETWEEN AUTHORITY AND TYRANNY, OR IS THE CONNECTION ONLY CHARACTERISTIC OF MODERN SOCIETY? And if the connection has a certain necessity, either universal or in modern times, what is the reason for it? Most important, we must decide whether Mr. Hayek is right in his contention that authority, in the sense that he objects to it, inevitably becomes tyranny.

What Is Authority?

To resolve these questions and to judge adequately of this thesis, a somewhat extended analysis of the nature of authority is necessary. In this way Catholic teaching concerning the state will be made manifest in relation to modern theories and the way prepared to judge of them in the light of the Catholic Faith.

In the first place it should be clear that authority can exist only when a group of men are united for a common purpose. Men by their very nature live together in society since they are not sufficient to themselves but require the aid of others, not only for physical survival, but, above all, for a truly human life. Society, therefore, is formed for the common good, inasmuch as this cooperation is not undertaken for the good of any one of the persons as an ultimate end. Now just as there is a principle in the individual, namely reason, which directs his acts so that he will attain his end in due course, so there must be a directive principle of society, if it is to attain its end; we call this principle the *common good*. The efficient principle is the ruler or government whose work it is to order all things as they are common that the common good may be attained. It is fitting that there be one person or one group of persons to concern itself with the common good, both because men are apt to place their private good above the common good, and because, if strife is to be avoided, it is necessary to have an authority to decide the means which are to be employed to attain the common

good. This authority may be one man, a group of men, or the will of the majority of the citizens.

Authority, therefore, follows from the very nature of the common good, and in like manner the kind of authority exercised will correspond to the particular nature of the particular common good, for, as we have said, there will be a common good whenever men cooperate for a particular end or purpose. Thus the authority of the ruler of the family, the father, differs from the authority of the ruler of the state, which in turn differs from the authority of God Who is the Ruler of the universe. By this principle a common good is higher as it is more universal, and the higher the common good the more completely the members of the society depend on it as deriving their good from it. Now, since God is the ultimate of common goods, we may, by analysis of that relation by which the universe depends on Him, arrive at the truth concerning the lesser common goods, such as the common good of the state, provided we are careful to predicate the properties of God as He is seen in this relation only according to proportion in regard to the rules of analogy.

SINCE MEN DEPEND ABSOLUTELY AND WITHOUT QUALIFICATION UPON GOD ALONE, IT WOULD FOLLOW THAT ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY BELONGS ONLY TO GOD. In the state the personal good does not depend absolutely on the common good, but only in this or that respect; consequently while authority would thus be attributed to the state, it would be a limited authority and not the absolute authority which is proper to God. It would follow that the authority of the head of the family would be even more limited, for the family is the least universal among common goods, and, furthermore, it depends not only on God, but on the state as well; on God in every respect, on the state only in some. Further, since the authority which a given order possesses comes to it in virtue of its rank in the hierarchy of common goods, it follows that, if this hierarchy is perverted or destroyed, the corresponding roles of authority will also be perverted. Thus when a state, denying that God is the ultimate common good, makes itself ultimate, it becomes man's last end, and it will arrogate to itself the authority that belongs to God alone. Now it is the property of God, as the absolute ruler of all creation, and therefore as its Creator, infallibly to bring about His Will without violating the freedom of His creatures. Thus when the state attributes to itself the authority proper to God, i.e. an absolute authority, since it in no way possesses the suavity of Divine Omnipotence, it must, if it is to attain its end, violate that freedom which it can no more move freely than it can create a free will in the first place. In short it will inevitably become tyranny. Such a state, imitating the omniscience and omnipotence of

God, would govern its citizens as God governs His creatures; this is the origin of totalitarian violence.

But the analysis must be carried further. The necessary limitations of any created authority are further manifested by the consideration of another property of Divine Rule. We have already seen two such properties, first, that God infallibly attains His Will in the creature; second, He attains it without violating such free wills as He has created. From these two a third follows, that God foreknows and causes the minutest happenings of the universe, attaining His Will sometimes through necessary secondary causes, sometimes through free secondary causes. Thus God governs the universe in every respect, not a leaf falling without His permission, or, as a socialist might put it, He organizes the world absolutely.

It follows that since the state is a society of persons, each being therefore a free agent, the authority exercising the rule for the common good must respect the nature of those agents, even as God Himself respects it. But further, since human authority, unlike the Divine, cannot, as we have seen, determine things absolutely without violence, the authorities of the state must be limited, leaving a measure of autonomy over which it can claim no dominion. This autonomy, further, would be not only personal, but would include the autonomy of the family as well as of smaller political units relative to the ultimate political ruling body. This would seem to be the metaphysical doctrine behind democracy (democracy taken in the sense of freedom and autonomy for inferiors), and it is remarkable how great a synthesis of authority and freedom was achieved when this doctrine was held, e.g. the rule in medieval France and Spain attested by the great autonomy in the Spanish provinces.

We may conclude that the test of a state will lie in its attitude to lower bodies and groups within the state. One which visions itself as God will inevitably tend to absorb the functions of lesser groups and thus destroy them. Virtually or actually, it affirms that there is only one cause, the state, which rules its citizens as Calvin's God rules creation. It will attempt to exercise a central planning authority which will destroy any freedom in its inferiors. Germany and Russia furnish convincing illustrations.

Socialism Leads to Tyranny

We may now return to Mr. Hayek's thesis. I think we must agree with his assertion that *socialism, or collectivism, inevitably leads to some sort of totalitarian tyranny*. Socialism's first principle is the centralization of all authority, planning and organizing the economic life of the state in one governing group; as such, it denies all secondary authority. Thus the centralized body will organize to an ever increasing

degree the entire state economy. This inevitably, and in proportion as its principle is maintained, annihilates freedom. As Hayek points out, Russian Communism and German National Socialism are merely the logical following out of the tenets of socialism. This is evident in the light of the above analysis, inasmuch as socialism arrogates to the state the kind of authority and organization that belongs properly to God. But in the created order, *absolute planning* and *freedom of action for inferiors* are simply incompatible, and, for this reason, we must accept Hayek's conclusion. There is an interesting corollary anent the liberals' claim that socialism is economic freedom. This is not the place to discuss that, but I think its speciousness is easily detected in the light of the preceding analysis.

We must also agree with Hayek in his conviction that economic and political freedom are necessarily connected. Just as a state that maintains as its right the authority and dominion proper to God alone, will inevitably swallow up all economic control, just as inevitably will it extend its absolute control to political matters. And we may add that absolute authority in political matters is just as incompatible with political freedom as absolute economic authority is with economic freedom. This is an a priori argument which is formally metaphysical; many authoritative Catholic writers have manifested it on properly political grounds.

Authority Must Be Maintained

We cannot, however, agree with Mr. Hayek's conviction that there is a necessary connection between authority and tyranny, nor with his maintenance of an absolute dichotomy between a competitive economy and collectivism. If, as we indeed agree, the socialist state is to be rejected, it does not follow that the only alternative is an individualistic economy in which there is no control of economic life beyond the impersonal discipline of the market. Strangely, it would seem, it is because he implicitly accepts a totalitarian doctrine that Mr. Hayek is led to reject authority. What is common to both positions is a certain unequivocal notion of authority: either it is denied altogether, or authority is absolute. The Nazis embraced absolute state authority because they saw one truth and were blind to the other. Now it appears Mr. Hayek sees the other side, rejecting authority because it seems it must be absolute as the Nazis rejected freedom because it appeared absolute. But as St. Thomas repeats again and again, whatever is said analogically, is said according to the more and the less, and BOTH "FREEDOM" AND "AUTHORITY" ARE, AS WE HAVE SEEN, ANALOGICAL TERMS. Both sides err in this that they fail to see the hierarchy of both freedom and authority. They see no essential difference between a created and uncreated authority, and hence do

not see that there is a properly limited authority which specifies political rule. And, as a matter of fact, the individualists make the same mistake about freedom that totalitarians make about authority. They want unlimited freedom for the individual just as the totalitarian wants unlimited authority for the state. For both there is no hierarchy either in the universe or in the state; neither side sees that a perfection is limited according to the limitation of the nature receiving that perfection. The contrary positions have a common metaphysics.

Perverted Authority

Yet, admitting that Hayek is wrong in equating authority with tyranny, there is a further difficulty, for he appears to have the facts on his side, at least the facts of modern history. We have all seen enough of the abuse of authority in our time not to be unaware that, at least practically, it seems to lead to tyranny. And so Hayek has due cause to fear authority, for only a very thin line separates it from the most outrageous violence. St. Thomas was well aware of this, and in his *De Regimine Principum* takes care to impose powerful checks upon the rulers' power. But in our day the danger seems to be even greater, as it is attested by the Holy Father's Christmas message of 1944 in which he asks that a greater role in government be given the people. When we ask why authority should be particularly dangerous in our time, we have not far to seek for the answer. Earlier we pointed out that the authority which a given order possesses is predicated of it in virtue of its place in the hierarchy of common goods, and that, if this hierarchy is perverted or destroyed, the roles of the respective authorities will also be perverted. Thus, when God is denied or ignored, the total hierarchy of things is immediately inverted, and the lower orders lose no time in taking God's place. From all this it is clear that a just state cannot exist as long as God is denied; for the state will never say merely that God does not exist, but rather it will, and does, say: "God exists, but I am He." It is therefore not only metaphysically necessary, but profoundly realistic, to maintain that a JUST STATE AND SOCIAL ORDER IS IMPOSSIBLE UNTIL MEN RECOGNIZE THE JUST SUBORDINATION OF ALL THINGS, NATURAL AND POLITICAL, TO GOD. Perhaps this is the providential meaning of our modern Feast of Christ the King.

A Middle Road

We may now see that, not only is a position between individualism and collectivism possible, but such an intermediary position provides the only possible just state. Such a state would not arrogate to itself the absolute planning of the economic life of the whole; there would be no central direction which would deny all subordinate direction, an abuse to which Hayek rightly objects for reason we have noted. A

just state would recognize that it cannot govern the whole of life, inasmuch as it could not do this without destroying freedom, but neither would it allow a state of society composed of autonomous, competing individuals, each solicitous of himself exclusively. Rather it would adopt a middle course, and, since God rules the universe through free, secondary agents, the state would in its turn leave the organizing and planning of economic life to those subordinate groups properly engaged in this task, that is, to the employers and workers. In short, there would not be one exclusive cause in the state, but a hierarchy of free causes.

But while we are insistent that the state has not the authority of God, yet we must not on the other hand forget that the state does participate in God's authority, and should exercise, therefore, a real power among the citizens. Solicitous as it is of the common good, IT MUST BE THE FINAL JUDGE WHETHER THE PLANNING OF THE SUBSIDIARY GROUPS FOSTERS OR HINDERS THIS END. In the words of Pius XI: ". . . the state . . . should be the supreme arbiter, ruling in kingly fashion far above all party contention, intent only upon justice and the common good." Elsewhere he describes the function of the state in regard to these groups as ". . . directing, watching, stimulating and restraining." Thus there would not be but one cause in the state, but the lower groups would be truly autonomous all the while they were being directed by the higher. This is an application to the state of the hierarchy of authority and freedom as it is found in the universe, and I think it can be readily shown that this is the philosophical doctrine underlying the various social encyclicals of the Popes.¹

It should be made clear that the purpose of this article is not to provide concrete proposals on specific economic issues, nor even to formulate the kind of political economy which seems to be most in harmony with the metaphysical points we have indicated. The purpose here is rather to formulate the philosophical principles underlying any just politic-economic order and thus to provide principles upon which contemporary economic proposals, especially in the controversy between free competition and planning, may be judged. It further proposes to demonstrate the metaphysical doctrines underlying the Papal social encyclicals. To that end a brief analysis of the *Quadragesimo Anno* of Pius XI will be given at this point.

¹ No attempt has been made to prove in this paper the Aristotelian-Thomistic doctrine of authority and freedom; rather the intention has been to let its truth be manifested by its fruits as applied to the fields of politics and economics. For only if one maintains that authority and freedom are compatible (in theological terms, that there is no incompatibility between Divine Omnipotence and human freedom) can one avoid the trap of the moderns. For if one holds that authority and freedom are incompatible, then a choice must necessarily be made between collectivism and individualism, both of which the Holy Father has told us must be avoided.

Papal Message

The Holy Father's conception of the state is that of a society organized in an ordered hierarchical fashion in which the state is in somewhat the position of an overseer, seeking always the common good, and respecting always the specific perfections of each level in society, not destroying their proper functions but rather providing any necessary help and protection that they may the better perform their functions:

... just as it is wrong to withdraw from the individual and commit to the community at large what private enterprise and industry can accomplish, so, too, it is an injustice, a grave evil and disturbance of right order for a larger and higher organization to arrogate to itself functions which can be performed efficiently by smaller and lower bodies. This is a fundamental principle of social philosophy, unshaken and unchangeable, and it retains full truth today. Of its very nature the true aim of all social activity should be to help individual members of the social body, but never to destroy and absorb them. The state should leave to these smaller groups the settlement of business of minor importance. It will thus carry out with greater freedom, power and success, the tasks belonging to it, because it alone can effectively accomplish these, directing, watching, stimulating and restraining, as circumstances suggest or necessity demands. Let those in power, therefore, be convinced that the more faithfully this principle be followed, and a graded hierarchial order exist between the various subsidiary organizations, the more excellent will be both the authority and the efficiency of the social organization as a whole and the happier and more prosperous the condition of the state.

This remarkable passage is typical of the Holy Father's care to maintain at once the authority of the state and the freedom of the lower groups, or, in terms of our analysis, the autonomy of the free, secondary causes. In an admirable way it reconciles the two in a just mean between the extremes of collectivism and individualism. In regard to the state taking to itself too much authority, the Holy Father adds:

We feel bound to add that to Our knowledge there are some who fear that the state is substituting itself in the place of private initiative, instead of limiting itself to necessary and sufficient help and assistance.

On the question of free competition the Pope adds:

... just as the ordering of human society cannot be built upon class warfare, so the proper ordering of economic affairs can-

not be left to free competition alone. From this source have proceeded in the past all the errors of the "Individualistic" school. This school, ignorant or forgetful of the social or moral aspects of economic matters, teaches that the state should refrain in theory and practice from interfering therein, because these possess in free competition and open markets a principle of self-direction better able to control them than any created intellect. Free competition, however, though within certain limits just and productive of good results, cannot be the ruling principle of the economic world. . .

Thus while free and unrestrained competition cannot be approved, neither can the control of economic life by a central state authority be justified. It is the task of the individual groups concerned, subject, however, to ". . . the state which should be the supreme arbiter, ruling in fashion far above all party contention, intent only upon justice and the common good. . . ." As mentioned above, the state's function would be "directing, watching, stimulating and restraining" and:

. . . true and genuine social order demands various members of society, joined together by a common bond. Such a bond of union is provided on the one hand by the common effort of employers and employees of one and the same group joining forces to produce goods or give service; on the other hand, by the common good which all groups should unite to promote, each in its own sphere, with friendly harmony. . . . From this it is easy to conclude that in these associations the common interest of the whole group must predominate: and among these common interests the most important in the directing of the activities of the group to the common good.

The Common Good

The so-called classical economics denied the whole concept of the common good, except insofar as it conceived it as the sum of individual goods and having its only reality in the individual goods. Contemporary thought, be it Communism, Fascism, Socialism, attributes great significance to the neglected concept. Common knowledge of totalitarian doctrine will attest to the truth of this assertion. As a classical liberal, Mr. Hayek rejects the doctrine of the common good, and in an interesting passage he explains why:

The common feature of all collectivist systems may be described, in a phrase dear to socialists of all schools, as the deliberate organization of the labors of society for a definite social goal. . . . The social goal, or "common purpose," for which society is to be organized is usually described as the

"common good," the "general welfare," or the "general interest." It does not need much reflection to see that these terms have no sufficiently definite meaning to determine a particular course of action. The welfare and happiness of millions cannot be measured on a SINGLE SCALE OF LESS AND MORE. (Capitalization mine)

What Mr. Hayek is objecting to in this passage, is fundamentally the same evil that founds his complaint against authority. The authority he objects to is wrong precisely because it absorbs and thereby destroys the lower orders; it becomes a sort of swollen monster, having, so to speak, devoured its inferiors so that it alone remains to contemplate the desolation it has wrought. **SUCH A COMMON GOOD IS A MISNOMER.** It is in fact a private good inasmuch as all other goods are denied for its sake, rather than fulfilled in it. Hayek describes this appalling caricature of the common good accurately:

The German idea of the state, as formulated by Fichte, Lassalle, and Rodbertus, is that the state is neither founded nor formed by individuals, nor an aggregate of individuals, nor is its purpose to serve any interest of individuals. It is a Volksgemeinschaft in which the individual has no rights but only duties. . . . There is a life higher than the individual life, the life of the people and the life of the state, and it is the purpose of the individual to sacrifice himself for that higher life.

We have here a clear illustration of the way in which modern totalitarians make the common good a private good, the good of a logical abstraction, a nation conceived as something existing apart from the persons who constitute it.

But we cannot infer, from the fact that the common good has no existence apart from the persons constituting the state, that it is formally identical with the good of those persons taken singularly, i.e. as a sum of personal goods. Rather **THE COMMON GOOD IS OF A SPIRITUAL ORDER**, at once containing the individual goods and greater than they, as St. Thomas says, more divine because it is more universal. In the state, as in the universe, we may distinguish two principles: the individuals and the order uniting them. Of these, the order is the more perfect and related to the individuals as form to matter. But since order implies a principle, there is necessarily one thing to which the individuals are ordered. In society it is the common good of the nation, in the universe it is God, the absolutely universal common good. Now one may, for one reason or another, consider the individuals in themselves, abstracting from the order of which they are a part, or one may consider solely the order of the individuals to their principle, i.e. the common good, be it the state or God. In so

doing one abstracts from the proper difference among things, conceiving them only as they differ in degree, not as they are different in kind. Thus the person, the family, the various professional groups, the trades, etc., are seen only as *less* than the state and as having no being or perfection which is not to be found in the more universal order as though that could subsist in itself. Even more, the state is conceived as a kind of substance in which alone the perfection is to be found, a sort of self-subsisting form. THIS HAPPENS WHEN WE ATTRIBUTE TO REALITY THE ACTUAL SEPARATIONS WHICH THE MIND MAKES WHEN IT CONSIDERS THINGS. In being the form depends on the matter, and the matter on the form. The common good, to apply the principle to the point under discussion, depends on the individuals in one way, and the individuals depend on the common good in another. The opposition which is established in a state of abstraction leads to a denial of one or the other of the principles.

The Root of the Error

The individualists see the perfection of the part, that the perfection of the whole, as a whole of order, presupposes the existence of persons composing the order; the common good, then, is seen as nothing (because it is supposed that the perfection of the person *in every way* can exist apart from the common good, the individual being a principle in one respect). The totalitarians, on the other hand, see the individuals as nothing because they attribute existence per se to the common good. But the common good so conceived is no longer the common good, because it is not common; it is a good opposed to the private good, and therefore itself a private good. Then the individual "has no rights but only duties"; the "higher life" is now predicated of the state per se, subsisting apart from individuals. But as such it is only a myth and serves to mask the selfish private interests of some special group. IT IS INTERESTING TO OBSERVE THAT BOTH PERSONALISTS AND TOTALITARIANS SINGULARIZE THE COMMON GOOD, AND THUS THEY AGREE THAT THERE IS NO COMMON GOOD. For both, the good of the individual and the good of the state are private goods.

This reduction of the common good to a private good is, as has been shown, common both to individualism (and its contemporary counterpart personalism) and to totalitarianism. Further, in both doctrines the private good that is substituted for the common good, and becomes a quasi common good, since it is that for whose sake all else exists, is the good of a person. In individualism it is the human person and in totalitarianism it is the state erected into a sort of person. Now this identification of the common good with the good of a person can only be understood by an analysis of the perfections proper to God as

the exemplar common good. In this ultimate common good we have the one case where the common good is also a person (excepting, of course, Christ). This union of perfections in God should properly be diversified in the lower orders so that the lesser common goods would not be persons but would, however, both be composed of persons and entrusted to a person, or persons, according to the form of government, having the authority to bring about the common good. Totalitarian states, however, having made themselves the final common good, **THEN ASSUMED THAT PERFECTION WHICH BELONGS ONLY TO GOD**, to be a personal common good. Individualism or personalism, on the contrary, having substituted the individual person for God **MAKES THE PERSON INTO THE ULTIMATE END OF ALL SOCIAL AND POLITICAL LIFE**, simply subordinating the state to the person. I think that it is only in this light that the classical liberal doctrine of individual self-interest in economics can be explained. (Interestingly enough this doctrine, although progressively abandoned in economic life in favor of planning, is now being increasingly applied to international affairs, so that it is assumed as a matter of course that each country should adopt the policy of individual self-interest in all matters of international policy.) The doctrine holds that by seeking one's own self-interest the welfare of the whole is infallibly attained. Clearly, it did not work; but it is interesting to understand why men were disposed to believe it. The doctrine of the common good, I believe, gives it its plausibility.

God and Man

Now God acts always for Himself, nothing outside of Himself is ever the cause of any action of His. But since God is the cause of all that is good in the universe, it happens that in acting for His own glory He has willed to create things outside of Himself and thus in acting for Himself God communicated His good to others. Since He is the universal common good it follows that in acting for Himself He benefits those who are dependent upon that common good and whose private good is derived from that common good. Hence, **MODERN LIBERAL SOCIETY HAVING SUBSTITUTED THE INDIVIDUAL PERSON FOR GOD ALSO ATTRIBUTES TO THE HUMAN PERSON THIS QUALITY OF GOD'S, VIZ. TO BE THE CAUSE OF ALL THAT IS GOOD IN THE UNIVERSE.** It then follows that in seeking his own good each man will communicate that goodness to others, as God does, and thus by seeking his own interest, be it economic or political, he will automatically procure the good of others. The individuals' personal goodness becomes the principle of the good that others obtain. The order of things has become completely reversed. This is but one example of the inversion of the order of the universe. In knowledge we

have the theory that a thing only exists insofar as it is known; in economics there is the labor value theory which holds that all the value of things men make is derived exclusively from the labor put into them; in mathematics we are told that mathematical objects are created by the mind, reality only furnishing the occasion for our knowing them.

But when we ask why both of these positions singularize the common good, and thus deny it, we are led to an important discovery. For a single error underlies both theories. On natural grounds, the underlying error is a false conception of the nature and purpose of the state. The state is conceived as existing only for the material well-being of the people. It is a victory for Marx since it amounts to a concession to his view that the economic consideration is the only valid one both for the state and for the individual. Since the only common good admitted is the economic one, the notion of the common good as a spiritual reality is clearly precluded. But to make the exclusive end of the state, and therefore its common purpose and goal, economic, is ipso facto to destroy the idea of the common good. **FOR ONLY A SPIRITUAL GOOD CAN BE SHARED BY MANY WITHOUT THE GOOD OF ONE NECESSARILY DESTROYING OR LESSENING THE GOOD OF ANOTHER.** This truth may be seen most clearly in the Exemplar of all societies, the Most Blessed Trinity. There the common good is the immaterial perfection of the very Deity. In the temporal human order, the state, composed of creatures having body and soul, the purely spiritual common good of the Blessed Trinity is imitated imperfectly; for, while it is primarily spiritual, it relates to material welfare, since men do live in a society in part to supply their material needs. When men denied this spiritual nature of the common good then, it was inevitable that henceforth only mutually exclusive and opposed private goods should exist in the state.

IT IS WORTH NOTING that the distinction, held by many contemporary Catholic writers, between the person and the individual, by which man is subordinated to the state only as he is an individual, and not as he is a person, raises the same difficulties encountered by individualistic and totalitarian doctrines. As a consequence of their views man would be subordinate to the state only as he is a material being and not according to his proper perfection as a man, i.e. his intellectual nature in virtue of which he is said to be a person. Thus for them too the common good, as a political reality, is not a spiritual good, nor is society formed for a proper spiritual end. Again the role of the state being reduced to the economic order, the doctrine entails all the evil consequences of individualism and totalitarianism. This is not to say that such persons in fact hold these views, but rather that these are the logical consequences of the distinction between person and indi-

vidual. To be consistent they would be constrained to hold these consequences.

In sharp contrast to these materialist views, Aristotle makes it plain that insofar as the good of the citizen is aimed at by the state, that good is happiness which he defines as activity in accordance with perfect and complete virtue. In this relation the fostering of virtue is the first function of the state; for that reason education plays an important part in politics. But because man cannot be happy without the physical necessities, his nature being what it is, his material needs must be regulated too. It is significant, however, that Aristotle, and the scholastic tradition, treat of economics as something, like ethics, presupposed by politics rather than included in it. But in so far as the private agencies fail, these things become a burden of the state, as the state must step in to punish young evildoers when their fathers do not exert their authority.

We have seen that the root cause, both of the denial of the common good and the socialist and marxist misconceptions of it, lies in the denial of the spiritual nature and end of society. The two moments in the genesis of this false doctrine would be, first, the denial of the spiritual nature of society; second, the denial of the common good, or a materialist degradation of it. It is natural to ask, at this point, what it was that disposed men to the conviction that society existed only for economic ends. As it is stated here, this would appear to be an error in the natural order, i.e. an error about the nature of the state, its end as such in relation to its citizens, etc. Yet it seems unreasonable that men as a whole (excepting Catholic thought) should have made so great an error, and for so long, in a matter so crucial to human happiness, except under the appearance of a superior truth. The observable facts almost suggest an explanation beyond the merely natural order. But in the light of the Faith it is abundantly evident. The spiritual nature of society was denied because men denied the ordination of the individual (individual and person are used here synonymously) to the state, and the private good to the common good. More precisely, it was claimed that insofar as man is a spiritual being, he is in no way subordinate to the state, but rather, in this order, the state was subordinate to him. **BUT WHY SHOULD THE INDIVIDUAL HAVE BEEN MADE THE END OF THE STATE?** Because of the alleged superior dignity of the individual as compared with the state, the transcendent dignity of the personal good, which appears private, relative to the common good which is transitory.

The Dignity of Man

Now the Greeks too were aware of the dignity of man, the dignity of an intellectual nature; but they did not for that reason deny the whole

natural ordination of the particular good to the more universal good of the state. And so we might ask whether the ancient Greeks and the moderns mean the same thing by the "dignity of man." The ancient concept is founded on natural reason alone; but is this true for the moderns? Here we must adduce the fact that the modern world has been profoundly influenced by Christian Revelation; that Revelation tells of a dignity conferred on man, a dignity infinitely higher than the dignity of nature, not something due to man, but a free gift having its principle in the infinite merit of Christ. In this connection it is worth recalling that in his Christmas Message of 1944, the Holy Father spoke of Christmas as the feast of human dignity, and, indeed, a single soul justified through Christ is immeasurably more precious than the whole natural universe.

When the modern liberal speaks of the dignity of man, then, is he in fact speaking of the natural dignity of a rational creature, the dignity of the person known to the Ancients? Even by natural reason it seems probable, but with the eye of the Faith we know that the moderns, although they deny Christ and the whole order of grace, persist in predicating of man the dignity which is his only by a supernatural gift. *Do not the moderns in fact see every man in the likeness of Christ, the very Christ they deny?* How else account for the quasi-mystical exaltation of the human person so prevalent and so powerful in recent times, the crusading zeal of the modern liberal with his desire to redeem man from the burden of poverty, oppression and injustice?

The Dignity of Christ

The truth emerges clearer when we consider Christ as He is King of the universe, its End and Final Cause. As such He is its Common Good, a Common Good Who is also a Person. More, He is so transcendent a Common Good that He is the Source of all that is good in men, their goodness being but a remote participation in His. With this doctrine in mind we may attempt to trace the process of secularization, following its two main streams as they take their source in Christ's twofold perfection, as Person and as Common Good. One line of thought, then, started from the doctrine that Christ is a Person and that every man, by participation in the life of Christ through grace, is "another Christ." Proceeding to a more integral secularization, having progressively denied Christ, it predicated the perfection of Christ of every man. Thus, as Christ is the end of the universe, so the individual became the end of the state, the personal good the end of the common good. As Christ is the Source of all goodness, so individuals, in acting for their own self-interest, were thought ipso facto to bring about the good of the whole; as Christ is the Source of all truth as Incarnate Wisdom, so the private opinions of each man became infallible sources of truth, truth became personal and, as another consequence, a multi-

tude of philosophical systems arose, each one peculiar to its creator.

On the other hand, the secularizing of Christ as the Common Good, having denied Christ, predicated His Goodness of the state. Then, just as men derive all their goodness from Christ and are at once totally dependent upon Him and totally subordinate to Him, so it is said that men are totally subordinate to the state, and dependent upon it, in no way escaping its power. Hayek's description of totalitarian doctrine as we have quoted it ("There is a life higher than the individual life, the life of the people and the life of the state, and it is the purpose of the individual to sacrifice himself for that higher life") assumes a heightened intelligibility. Is it not in fact through a perversion of Christ's doctrine that men will sacrifice themselves in the way they do for a totalitarian state? But this is matter for understanding, not for demonstration.

Implications of This Analysis

If this analysis is correct, it has important implications for the resolution of contemporary errors. It would follow that any attempt to treat such errors as individualism, personalism, collectivism, as errors simply in the natural order, must be inadequate. True enough they are errors about natural things, but the natural error is in the nature of a term produced by doctrines outside the natural order. *Hence these economic and political doctrines so vital to contemporary thought and life are ultimately and fully intelligible only in the light of the Faith.* By the light of natural reason one may see (at least theoretically one is able to see) that these doctrines are irrational; but we fail to see how they exert so profound an influence over men's minds. Even more seriously, not understanding that supernatural truth is the source of their strength, we are helpless to overcome the error.

It was the misinterpretation of the Christian doctrine of the dignity of man, then, which led men to believe that there is no subordination to the state in the personal, i.e. spiritual order. Once this was accepted, it necessarily followed that the only function of the state was in the material welfare of its citizens. (As a matter of fact it was first denied that the state had any dominion over economic matters, but, as it was progressively realized that subordination in this order was a practical necessity, the state began to assume this role.) Likewise, subordination in the material order being more or less recognized today, it is coming to be realized, particularly in the totalitarian countries, that subordination in the spiritual order is also necessary. Thus we see in Russia, for example, the organization of the whole life around a common ideology, granted it is in a paradoxical way a materialist spirituality. That is, the whole life is centered about *ideas* of the economic process.

Further, we may readily see how advantageous it would be to the Enemy of souls to bring about this perverted doctrine of the state. For God ordained men to live in a temporal society by way of attaining their end, the supernatural end as well as the end of natural happiness, to live, that is, under the dominion of a state whose duty it was to foster virtue in its citizens. If this is denied him, therefore, man is deprived of that natural aid to his spiritual good which God had intended for him. Political and economic doctrines, then, most definitely are not matters indifferent to the Faith. But again, neither is the Faith indifferent to politics. The subversion of the political order following the denial of Christ recalls His words: "Do not think I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." Christ, Our Lord, is the Creator of heaven and earth. Our Redeemer is also the Author of our nature. That is why Holy Mother Church so carefully safeguards the truths of nature, knowing as She does that grace works through nature. By the same reasoning, the Powers of darkness are constrained to undermine nature and to obfuscate the truths of natural reason. Only in the Church, therefore, will the totalitarians, the individualists, the liberals, find the truth they cherish purified of every error and therefore not constraining them to deny another truth. Totalitarians will find themselves subordinated to the common good, liberals will find the true principle of community, and both liberals and individualists will find the justice and freedom of person which can only be attained when every man is loved as Christ and because of Christ; for only then will the natural law be fulfilled.

WILLIAM DAVEY, T.O.P.



SECURITY

Ah, to be rich,
Never fretting nor crying,
With nothing to fear,
But the prospect of dying.

BOOK REVIEWS

Estranged Bedfellows

MODERN CHRISTIAN REVOLUTIONARIES

Edited by Donald Attwater

Devin-Adair Company

Price: \$4.00

upon an unhappy Donald Attwater all sorts of authors and subjects likely to catch the attention of this or that buying public. But this thesis breaks down when one reads the introduction, in which the editor professes to be happy about this babel of tongues, this potpourri of truth and error.

Be it on Mr. Attwater's head then. The result of his endeavors is utter chaos. Of his five subjects, only two are Catholic; of his five authors, only one, himself. The one study of a Catholic by a Catholic is the only really commendable section of the book. The subject is Eric Gill, whose very close friend Donald Attwater was, and it is admirably done. It is as neat and precise an analysis of Gill's thought as one could wish, and Gill was eminently qualified to be considered a modern Christian revolutionary.

I cannot find the heart to denounce the study of Chesterton with the wrath it deserves because F. A. Lea, who did it seven years or so ago, has already recanted in part, in appended notes, and has no doubt already had the wrath of Catholic England on his head. Suffice it to say that F. A. Lea is not a Catholic (and openly deplores the misfortune of Chesterton's conversion), was only twenty-three years old when the essay was written, and throughout it compares G. K. Chesterton unfavorably with someone named John Middleton Murry, a pantheist and marxist.

The study of Nicolas Berdyaev is very competently done. Berdyaev is nominally a Russian Orthodox, philosophically really an existentialist. His biographer and critic, Eugueny Lampert, understands Berdyaev, understands Russian, understands the Orthodox Church and knows the position of the Roman Catholic Church, so his study is precise and intelligible. Those who are familiar with Berdyaev only through his study of the bourgeois mind will be surprised to see how far his thinking has strayed from Christianity. He is a revolutionary, in a sense, but is he Christian?

The same question arises in regard to the essay on Kierkegaard, Berdyaev's philosophical forebearer in existentialism. But apart from whether or not Kierkegaard really fits under the heading of a Christian revolutionary, it would have served some purpose to have made a penetrating study of his existentialism in the light of St. Thomas, inasmuch as the doctrine is causing a mild flurry at the moment. But this study by M. S. Channing-Pearce only adds to the confusion. It is bad enough that a man who does not really understand should try to analyze another man who did not really understand either (and in a different way), but Mr. Channing-Pearce goes to the trouble of quoting a dozen or so other men who don't really understand (in their diverse fashions) and once in a while suggests a wild parallel between Kierkegaard's philosophical errors and the progress of the soul to God as described by St. John of the Cross. In the end all you can be sure of is that Kierkegaard was a profoundly melancholic man.

There is no point in detailed discussion of the fifth essay, as it is the same story. Nichol Macnicol, a vague Protestant, analyzes Charles Freer Andrews, another vague Protestant, in a worshipful treatise lacking key concrete facts. It is hard to see anything through the haze, but seemingly Andrews was a

gentle and winning person who fell into ineffectual sentimentality from which Catholicism would have saved him. He went to India, where he was a friend of Gandhi and Tagore, and where he evidently lost his Christianity in a blur of universal brotherhood. He does not sound (for all that he worked against racial discrimination) either Christian or revolutionary, but he was probably very nice.

CAROL JACKSON

The Natural Law

THE NATURAL LAW

By Heinrich A. Rommen

Trans. by T. R. Hanley

Herder

Price: \$7.50

Any treatment of a fundamental philosophical concept should have the twofold aim of analyzing and exposing the concept and defending its validity against attacks. These two aims guide the author of this book on the natural law.

He has devoted the major portion of the work to an historical survey of the origin and development of the natural law concept from the Greeks to the present day. His most effective defense of the concept is also contained in this section, for he brings out clearly the vitality of the concept, its ineradicability from human thought. He makes excellent defensive use of the horrible effects of a denial of the natural law that all of us have had to witness during the last decade. At present all serious ethical, juridical and political thinkers are on the spot and the author refuses to let them get off it without acknowledging the need of some fundamental norms that are above the individual and the state.

After tracing the historical fortunes of the natural law concept, the author passes to a consideration of the nature and content of the natural law. Such problems as the relationship of metaphysics and ethics, morality and law, the individual and the community, natural and positive law, come up for discussion. These problems are presented sharply enough, but the author does not penetrate very deeply in giving a solution. Perhaps he is restrained by a consideration of his readers; in some cases, as, for example, in his discussion of the relation of person and the common good, it seems that the author is just not taking sides. At least, that is the impression that is given.

A simple exposition of a traditional doctrine that is under attack is not very helpful either to those who still cling to the doctrine or to those who attack it. A vigorous defense of it must be made. Such a defense may not convince those who deny the doctrine, although they are attacking it on the basis of half-truths and hidden errors. But a complete defense is even more necessary for the benefit of those who still hold the traditional doctrine more from sentiment or an external reason, such as the author develops in his first section, than from deep conviction and a penetration of the flimsiness of the opposing arguments. This task, which should be expected from a contemporary work on the natural law, is not done with any thoroughness by the author of the present volume.

JAMES M. EGAN, O.P.

Therefore I say to you, be not solicitous for your life, what you shall eat, nor for your body, what you shall put on. Is not the life more than the meat: and the body more than the raiment? Behold the birds of the air, for they neither sow, nor do they reap, nor gather into barns: and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not you of much more value than they? And which of you by taking thought, can add to his stature one cubit? And for raimen why are you solicitous? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow: they labour not, neither do they spin. But I say to you, that not even Solomon in all his glory was arrayed as one of these. And if the grass of the field, which is today, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, God doth so clothe: how much more you, O ye of little faith? Be not solicitous therefore, saying, What shall we eat: or what shall we drink, or wherewith shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the heathens seek. For your Father knoweth that you have need of all these things. Seek ye therefore first the kingdom of God, and his justice, and all these things shall be added unto you. Be not therefore solicitous for tomorrow; for the morrow will be solicitous for itself. Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof.